



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,917	02/08/2001	Clay H. Fisher	50N3695.01/1582	9084
24272	7590	09/28/2007		
Gregory J. Koerner Redwood Patent Law 1291 East Hillsdale Boulevard Suite 205 Foster City, CA 94404			EXAMINER JERABEK, KELLY L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/781,917

**Applicant(s)**

FISHER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kelly L. Jerabek

**Art Unit**

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***New Examiner of Record***

The prosecution of this application has been transferred to Examiner Kelly Jerabek from the docket of Examiner Gary Vieaux. Any inquiry concerning this Office Action or earlier communications should be directed to the current Examiner of record. Current contact information is provided in the last section of this communication.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### **Response to Remarks:**

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 42 (Amendment pages 15-16) state that the Steinberg reference fails to identically teach every element of the claims, and therefore does not anticipate the present invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The language of claim 42 is as follows: "A system for manipulating image data, comprising:

means for storing one or more ancillary data files;  
means for capturing said image data;  
means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing; and  
means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files."

First, the Specification provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files which includes a service on a distributed computer network like the Internet, a discrete electronic device such as a personal computer, or a removable, non-volatile memory device such as a flash memory (p. 6 lines 16-20.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files which also includes a personal computer (fig. 1 indicator 14; col. 3 lines 57-60), as well as a removable, non-volatile memory device (fig. 1 indicator 22; col. 4 lines 1-3.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Second, the Specification provides means for capturing said image data that includes an electronic camera device (fig. 1 indicator 110; p. 6 lines 25-26.) Equally, the Steinberg reference provides means for capturing said image data that also includes a camera (fig. 1 indicator 10.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Third, the Specification provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which

Art Unit: 2622

includes wireless communications (fig. 6 indicator 632), removable storage media (fig. 6 indicator 636), and "any required type of interfaces or connectors (not shown) for coupling camera device 110 and other electronic devices or entities to thereby support bi-directional communications" (p. 12 lines 1-27.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which also includes wireless communications, removable storage media, and cable (fig. 1 indicators 20, 22, and 38; col. 3 lines 45-60.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Fourth and finally, the Specification provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files that includes a central processing unit (fig. 3 indicator 344) employed in combining of image data with ancillary data (p. 9 lines 12-29.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files which also includes a processor to execute camera functionality (fig. 4 indicator 122; col. 7 lines 14-19.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Based on the foregoing comparisons, it is demonstrated that each of the claimed limitations are also found within the Steinberg reference, and therefore the rejection to claim 42 is forthwith maintained by the Examiner.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment pages 17-18) state that the Sarbadhikari reference fails to disclose the claimed "on-line management procedures" and also

submit that the “computer” disclosed in Sarbadhikari is in no way analogous to their claimed “data source being implemented as a computer” . The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sarbadhikari provides a teaching of a data source being employed for not only downstream processing of images, but also being employed to transfer files (data, code, etc.) to an imaging device (col. 4 lines 37-56 - lines 40-49 inclusive.) Sarbadhikari further provides that these files may be selected by the user by means of appropriate intervention through the camera, and that the data source is capable of two-way communication with the imaging device, communication that occurs while the data source is connected to the imaging device. This selection of files by the user, during two-way communication between the data source connected to the imaging device is clearly found to be on-line management while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists. The Examiner further maintains that the computer disclosed by Sarbadhikari meets the limitations of the claimed “data source”.

Applicant’s arguments (Amendment pages 18-19) state that the Sarbadhikari reference provides specific beneficial teaching against communicating between a camera and a computer through a cable interface and thus Sarbadhikari teaches away from their claimed invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Sarbadhikari discloses an embodiment where images are transferred from a camera to a computer via a removable memory rather than a cable interface, Sarbadhikari also discloses that image data may be transferred using an interface cable (38) (col. 11, lines 22-30). Furthermore, the claims of the application do not make any mention of a cable interface.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment pages 19-20) state that the Sarbadhikari reference fails to teach any sort of "on-line management procedures" as claimed by the applicants. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sarbadhikari provides a teaching of a data source being employed for not only downstream processing of images, but also being employed to transfer files (data, code, etc.) to an imaging device (col. 4 lines 37-56 - lines 40-49 inclusive.) Sarbadhikari further provides that these files may be selected by the user by means of appropriate intervention through the camera, and that the data source is capable of two-way communication with the imaging device, communication that occurs while the data source is connected to the imaging device. This selection of files by the user, during two-way communication between the data source connected to the imaging device is clearly found to be on-line management while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists. Additionally, Sarbadhikari, at column 7 lines 15-50, teaches the imaging device being used to view operational information related to the imaging device, including ancillary data files. Sarbadhikari further provides that the data files, when available via the data source, can be identified on a display and that user intervention for selection of data files is conducted by the use of inputs in conjunction with the imaging device display, which is found to be a demonstration of one or more on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view, manipulate, and select said ancillary data files. The Examiner maintains that the above teachings provided by Sarbadhikari constitute "on-line management procedures". The Examiner

notes that the term "on-line management procedures" is a broad term and the examiner has given it its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment page 20) state that Steinberg explicitly refers to the network computer as a "destination" and not as a "data source", as claimed by applicants and therefore the limitations of the claim are not met. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Sarbhadhikari reference, at column 11 lines 26-37, teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, which is connected to the imaging device. However, although Sarbhadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, Sarbhadhikari is not found to teach the computer being a computer in a distributed computer network (emphasis added.) Therefore, the Steinberg reference is employed to demonstrate the teaching of a computer being employed as a computer in a distributed computer network. Steinberg, at column 4 at lines 2-4 and 49-53, and by way of figure 1 indicators 16 and 18, clearly teaches an imaging device connected to a computer and the computer being a computer in a network, bi-directionally communicating data. Motivation to combine the teaching of these references was also provided (Office Action dated July 15, 2005), which stated "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbhadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transfer of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of



the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer. **The claimed term “data source” is broad in nature and the Examiner is giving it its broadest reasonable meaning. The Examiner maintains that the “remote computerized destination” disclosed by Steinberg constitutes the claimed “data source”. A remote computerized destination is actually a narrower term than a data source and a remote computerized destination is a type of data source. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.**

Applicants arguments (Amendment pages 20-21) submit that the Steinberg reference fails to teach any sort of “on-line management procedures” and that the Steinberg reference teaches away from their claimed invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Sarbahikari reference, at column 11 lines 26-37, teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, which is connected to the imaging device. However, although Sarbadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, Sarbadhikari is not found to teach the computer being a computer in a distributed computer network (emphasis added.) Therefore, the Steinberg reference is employed to demonstrate the teaching of a computer being employed as a computer in a distributed computer network. Steinberg, at column 4 at lines 2-4 and 49-53, and by way of figure 1 indicators 16 and 18, clearly teaches an imaging device connected to a computer and the computer being a computer in a network, bi-directionally

communicating data. Motivation to combine the teaching of these references was also provided (Office Action dated July 15, 2005), which stated "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment page 21) state that the Steinberg reference discloses only a "communications network" and not a "distributed computer network" as claimed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Steinberg, at column 4 at lines 2-4 and 49-53, and by way of figure 1 indicators 16 and 18, clearly teaches an imaging device connected to a computer and the computer being a computer in a network, bi-directionally communicating data. The Examiner maintains that the network taught by Steinberg constitutes a "distributed computer network".

Applicant's arguments (Amendment pages 21-22) state that the Steinberg reference teaches away from their claimed invention, as the data flow described in Steinberg is in the opposite direction to the data flow recited by the Applicants. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Sarbahikari reference, at column 11 lines 26-37, teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, which is connected to the imaging device. However, although Sarbadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, Sarbadhikari is not found to teach the computer being a computer in a distributed computer network (emphasis added.) Therefore, the Steinberg reference is employed to demonstrate the teaching of a computer being employed as a computer in a distributed computer network. Steinberg, at column 4 at lines 2-4 and 49-53, and by way of figure 1 indicators 16 and 18, clearly teaches an imaging device connected to a computer and the computer being a computer in a network, bi-directionally communicating data. Motivation to combine the teaching of these references was also provided (Office Action dated July 15, 2005), which stated "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

Regarding claims 2-11, 13-17, 22-31, 33-37 and 46, each claim depends either directly from or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 21, and thus inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 or 21, respectively. Consequently, based on their

dependence and the foregoing response to arguments relating to claims 1 and 21, the Examiner respectfully maintains the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 2-20 and 22-40, as they relate to claims 1 or 21, respectively.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment page 23) state that since the Examiner states that Applicant's claimed "descriptor tag" is "inherent" as support for the rejections without providing any specific references for support. It appears that the Examiner is utilizing Official Notice without expressly stating so. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner was not utilizing Official Notice when mentioning inherency. Sarbadhikari states that enhancement files (24b) are identified on the operation display (3) (col. 7, lines 31-44). Therefore, the Examiner maintains that in order for the enhancement files (24b) to be identified there inherently must be descriptor tags to identify, characterize and categorize the enhancement files (24b). Thus, Sarbadhikari inherently includes descriptor tags.

Regarding claims 12 and 32 (Amendment pages 26-27), Applicant also submits that cited references fail to teach that the ancillary data files are created by both a system user on a local computer device and a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production equipment". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 12 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 *supra*), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data

production equipment ('264 - col. 6 lines 58-63.) However, although neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to teach a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are also created by a system user on a local computer device, Aihara is found to teach that a user can create the ancillary data file (col. 7 lines 33-38.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a user to create the ancillary data file, in conjunction with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg in which ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer, so that a user may not only have the ability to employ the ancillary data files provided by a manufacturer, but also to create their own ancillary data files in order to give the result its distinctive appearance ('190 - col. 7 lines 36-38.) It is further noted that the specification at lines 1-8 of page 15, provides for the creation of ancillary data files by the system user in one embodiment, and alternatively, by a manufacturer in another.

Applicant's arguments (Amendment page 27) further state that the Aihara reference is directed towards creating a "web page" and thus Aihara does not teach creating "ancillary data files" as claimed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claimed term "ancillary data files" is broad in nature and the Examiner is giving it its broadest reasonable meaning. The Examiner maintains that the "web page" disclosed by Aihara includes the claimed "ancillary data files". Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 18-20 and 38-40 (Amendment pages 27-28) state that each claim depends either directly from or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 21, and thus inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 or 21, respectively. Consequently, based on their dependence and the foregoing response to arguments relating to claims 1 and 21, the Examiner respectfully maintains the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 18-20 and 38-40, as they relate to claims 1 or 21, respectively. With regard to claims 18 and 38, applicant's arguments further state that the Anderson reference fails to teach a "data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network" as claimed by the applicants. However, the Examiner notes that the combination of the Sarbadhikari and Steinberg references already provides this teaching. The Anderson reference is being provided to provide the teaching of an off-line management procedure. Therefore, the combination of the Sarbadhikari, Steinberg and Anderson references discloses all of the limitations of the claim.

Regarding claim 41, as Applicants have incorporated their prior remarks by reference with regard to independent claim 41 (Amendment pages 28-29), the foregoing responses to the rejections of claim 21 are provided as response in kind.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 43 (Amendment pages 29-30) state that the claimed ancillary data file is not the same as the "camera programming" recited in Harada and that deleting an image data file is not the same as "rewriting" taught by

Harada. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicants have not stated why the camera programming disclosed by Harada is different than the claimed ancillary data or how the rewriting taught by Harada is not the same as deleting image data. The Examiner maintains that the Harada reference meets the limitations of the claims. Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 43 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), except wherein a data manager from said ancillary data module deletes a local ancillary data file in said imaging device after detecting a file type of a newly-downloaded one of said ancillary data files.

Nevertheless, Harada is found to teach the rewriting of camera programming upon detecting that a newer version has been downloaded (col. 6 line 28 – col. 7 line 7; in which the rewriting of a file is determined by the examiner to be equivalent to a deletion because the original file is ultimately replaced by a newer version of the file.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to delete a local file after detecting a newer file as taught by Harada with the method as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to provide a method updating camera programming while maintaining minimum/lower memory requirements.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 44 (Amendment pages 31-32) state that the Examiner has not provided proper motivation to combine each of cited references with all of the foregoing references. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The rejection provided by Examiner Vieaux is as follows:

Regarding claim 44, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), including wherein said ancillary data files include a text overlay file for superimposing upon said image data ('264 – col. 5 lines 22-27), special program instructions that directly enable or instruct said image device how to utilize said ancillary data files ('264 – col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 25), and template files that that are utilized as settings or frameworks for combining with said image data ('264 col. 10 line 24 – col. 11 line 13), said template files including an image transition file ('264 – col. 10 lines 46-50) and a still template file ('264 – figs. 8 and 9, col. 10 lines 26-30.) However, although Sarbadhikari and Steinberg provide for the inclusion of other files capable of affecting the captured image data ('264 – col. 4 lines 61-63), neither expressly provide for a background file of visual background data for combining with said image data, or template files including an animated template file and a voice-annotated template file.

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files as taught by Qian with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.**



Berstis is found to disclose voice annotation programming (fig. 3 indicator 304, col. 4 lines 5-8.) **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for a voice-annotation as taught by Berstis as another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, and backgrounds, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.**

Silverbrook is found to disclose animation programming (col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 6.) **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for animation as taught by Silverbrook as another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, Qian, and Berstis so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, backgrounds, and voice-annotations, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to further expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.**

Further, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files as taught by Aihara, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the**

**user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.**

**Examiner Vieaux provided motivation to combine each newly cited reference with all of the foregoing cited references.**

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 45 (Amendment pages 33-34) state that the Examiner has not provided proper motivation to combine each of cited references with all of the foregoing references. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The rejection provided by Examiner Vieaux is as follows:

Regarding claim 45, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 11/31 supra), except for expressly disclosing wherein said descriptor tag includes a data format, a data type, a data structure, and a data size.

Nevertheless, it is well known to those skilled in the art to include descriptor information associated with data information, as disclosed by Park (data structure and size, col. 4 lines 22-24), Kondoh (data format, col. 4 lines 60-64), and Satoh (data type,

fig. 50, col. 26 lines 57-66.) **Based on these teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a wide breadth of information to be includable with a descriptor tag so expand embedded run information and other related pre-processed information.**

**Examiner Vieaux provided motivation to combine each newly cited reference with all of the foregoing cited references.**

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 47-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2622

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steinberg et al. (US 6,006,039.)**

Regarding claim 42, Steinberg teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising: means for storing one or more ancillary data files (fig. 1 indicator 14); means for capturing said image data (fig. 1 indicator 10); means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing (fig. 1 indicators 20,22, and 38); and means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files (fig. 4 indicator 122.).

**Claims 21 and 47-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Squilla et al. (US 6,396,537).**

Re claims 21 and 53, Squilla discloses a system for manipulating image data capable of performing a method for manipulating image data, comprising the steps of: storing one or more ancillary data files (graphics, photos, video/audio clips, etc.) in a data source (10), said data source (10) being implemented as a computer (14) in a distributed computer network (col. 3, lines 57-63); capturing said image data with an imaging device (24) and transferring said one or more ancillary data files (graphics,

photos, etc.) in an ancillary data flow from said data source (10) to said imaging device (24) by using an ancillary data module (microprocessor 42) (col. 4, lines 3-25; col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 17). Squilla further discloses manipulating the image data with one or more ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.), said ancillary data module (42) performing on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes the imaging device (24) to view the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) that are stored on the data source (10), to manipulate the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) that are stored on the data source (10), to select the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) that are stored on the data source (10) and to download the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) from the data source (10) to the imaging device (24), the on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists from the imaging device (24) to the computer (14) in the distributed computer network (col. 5, lines 1-17; col. 8, lines 39-56), the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) including one or more image data files that the imaging device (24) combines with the image data to create a new composite image (col. 5, lines 1-13).

Re claim 47, Squilla further states that an ancillary data module (microprocessor 42) performs an off-line management procedure for the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) that have been downloaded from the data source (10), the off-line management procedure including the ancillary data module (42) analyzing descriptors from the ancillary data files and coordinating corresponding off-line file management

procedures by alternately utilizing both an automatic process and an interactive process with a system user, the off-line file management procedures including a file descriptor identification procedure by which the ancillary data module (42) categorizes the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) and the imaging device (24) updating camera menus to including the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) to enable a system user to utilize the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) (col. 4, lines 3-25; col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 17).

Re claim 48, Squilla discloses that the on-line management procedures only occur while the imaging device (24) is in an on-line state that permits bi-directionally communicating through the distributed computer network directly to the computer (14 of the image spot 10)(col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 17).

Re claim 49, Squilla discloses a distributed computer network that is implemented as an Internet network (col. 3, lines 57-63).

Re claim 50, Squilla discloses that a system user may utilize the ancillary data module (microprocessor 42) to locally view displayed images of the ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) during on-line management procedures (col. 5, lines 1-17; col. 8, lines 39-56).

Re claim 51, Squilla states that the system will automatically select ancillary data to be sent based on a personality profile of the user of the camera (col. 6, line 51-col. 7, line 28). Therefore, it can be seen that Squilla teaches that ancillary data files (graphics, photos, etc.) are automatically selected without intervention by a system user.

Re claim 52, Squilla states that the ancillary data module may be implemented as a software program (col. 3, lines 42-46).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 4-11, 13-17, 21, 24-31, and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325.)**

Regarding claim 1, Sarbadhikari teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising a data source configured to store one or more ancillary data files (fig. 11

Art Unit: 2622

indicator 4; col 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a computer (fig. 11 indicator 4), an imaging device configured to capture said image data (fig. 11 indicator 1), and an ancillary data module for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device for manipulating said image data (fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), said ancillary data module performing on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, and to download said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device, said one or more on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 37-56; col. 7 lines 15-50; col. 9 lines 9-13), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 40.) Although Sarbadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, with the same functionality that is provide by the removable memory card embodiment applied therein (col. 11 lines 26-37), a data source being implemented as *a computer in a distributed computer network* is not taught (emphasis added.)

Nevertheless, Steinberg teaches a similar system for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed (fig. 1



indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

Regarding claim 4, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 4 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device includes at least one of a digital still camera device ('264 - col. 5 lines 55-57), a video camera device, and an electronic scanner device.

Regarding claim 5, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 5 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are transferred from said data source to said imaging device ('264 - col. 2 line 50 - col. 3 line 2) by utilizing a wireless transmission process ('325 - col. 4 lines 61-65.)

Regarding claim 6, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 6 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said

ancillary data module manipulates said image data by combining selected ones of said ancillary data files with said image data to generate new composite data ('264 - col. 10 line 33-39.)

Regarding claim 7, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 7 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device includes a capture subsystem ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 10) and a control module ('264 - fig. 10 indicators A and B), said control module having a central processing unit ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 20), a memory ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 32, indicator 31), a viewfinder ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 29), and one or more input/output interfaces ('264 - fig. 10 indicators 21 and 26.)

Regarding claim 8, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 8 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said memory includes an application software program ('264 - col. 10 lines 1-4), an operating system ('264 - col. 7 lines 51-52), said ancillary data module (driving indicators 20, 18, and 22 of fig. 10), said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 8 lines 52-58, col. 10 lines 5-6), a display manager ('264 - col. 9 lines 6-11 and col. 7 lines 44-49), data storage for storing said image data ('264 - fig. 4, fig. 10 indicators 18 and 35, col. 9 lines 15-26), and one or more camera menus for display upon said viewfinder ('264 - col. 7 lines 44-49, col. 9 lines 6-11.)

Regarding claim 9, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 9 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more input/output interfaces include a distributed electronic network interface ('325 fig. 1 indicator 16), a host computer interface ('264 - fig. 11 indicator 34; '325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a printer interface ('325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a wireless communications interface ('325 col. 4 lines 61-65), a user interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 21), and a removable storage media interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 26; '325 fig. 2 indicator 58.)

It is also noted by the Examiner that this claim, as currently written, only requires a minimum of one input/output interface, by way of the limiting language of "one or more input/output interfaces".

Regarding claim 10, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 10 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module includes a download manager for transferring said ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device and analyzing said ancillary data files ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-67), an editing module for combining said one or more ancillary data files with said image data ('264 - col. 9 lines 13-21), a data manager for controlling and reorganizing said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 4 lines 63-64, col. 5 lines 22-25, col. 7 lines 60-65, and col. 9 lines 13-50) and miscellaneous routines that include a conversion routine for translating said one or more ancillary data files into a compatible format ('325 - figs. 3 and 9, col. 7 lines 10-13.)

Regarding claim 11, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 11 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files each include a data portion and a corresponding descriptor tag that is analyzed by said ancillary data module to identify, characterize, and categorize a corresponding one of said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 4 lines 58-63, col. 7 lines 31-44, in which information other than the included data is inherently necessary for identification of the enhancement.)

Regarding claim 13, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 13 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said data source is configured to facilitate interactively accessing, manipulating, and downloading said one or more ancillary data files to said imaging device by a system user ('264 - col. 7 lines 38-50.)

Regarding claim 14, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 14 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device establishes an active bi-directional electronic communication path to said data source ('264 - col. 4 lines 44-47), said active bi-directional electronic communication path being established by both an automatic connection protocol ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-65, in which detection of the presence of a card and the presence of a connection to a computer are read to be comparable) and also by a user-initiated connection protocol ('264 - col. 4 lines 46-47; fig. 11 via connection of indicator 38.)

Regarding claim 15, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 15 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 14 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module performs one or more on-line management procedures while said active bi-directional electronic communication path is available, said one or more on-line management procedures including a data source content review ('264 - col. 7 lines 32-40, 54-57) and an ancillary-data file download procedure ('264 - col. 7 lines 60-65.)

It is also noted by the Examiner that this claim, as currently written, only requires a minimum of one on-line management procedure, by way of the limiting language of "one or more on-line management procedures".

Regarding claim 16, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 16 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module downloads a special instruction file that corresponds to a selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file including information that instructs said imaging device how to correctly utilize said selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file being formatted as an embedded instruction file that is embedded in said selected ancillary data file ('264 - col. 10 lines 43-50) and also as a discrete instruction file that is not embedded in said selected ancillary data file ('264 - col. 9 line 51 – col. 10 line 18; col. 10 lines 43-50.)

Regarding claim 17, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 17 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device terminates said active bi-directional electronic communication path to said data source when said on-line management procedures have been completed, said active bi-directional electronic communication path being terminated by both a user-initiated termination protocol ('264 - fig. 3, col. 9 lines 3-14, in which an analogous process would apply to a tethered data source instead of an inserted card; '325 – col. 5 lines 15-17) and an active bi-directional electronic communication path being terminated by an automatic termination protocol ('325 – col. 5 lines 19-23.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for both user-initiated termination protocol, in which actions of a user control the camera use, as well as automatic termination in order to allow a system user the flexibility to both control functionality, as well as have various processes operate seamlessly in the background without the need for user interaction.

Regarding claims 21, 24-31, and 33-37, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 1, 4-11, and 13-17, respectively, as discussed above.

**Claims 2 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), with a supporting reference Creamer et al. (US 6,930,709.)**

Regarding claim 2, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 2 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), except for explicitly teaching a system wherein said data source includes an image station site on an Internet network.

The Examiner cites as supporting reference, Creamer et al. (US 6,930,709- filed on December 3, 1998), to illustrate the related equivalency of a computer in a distributed computer network being employed as “an image station site on an Internet network”, a concept and equivalency that is well known and expected in the art. Creamer details a general purpose personal computer, incorporated in concert with the World Wide Web, that has the ability to place an image on the Internet, as well as states that the computer is usually dedicated to serving the camera (col. 1 lines 16-65.) Therefore, this reference is presented to support what is well known with respect to a computer dedicated and used for image data and connected to the Internet, being equivalent in naming convention to an image station site on an Internet network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the computer in a distributed computer network to be an image station on an Internet network for the purposes of having a dedicated general purpose computer employed for image/camera related tasks such as manipulating image data, and which can be accessed via remote locations connected throughout the world wide web or an equivalent distributed network for the purpose of manipulating image data. (It is also noted that Applicants define the Internet as a distributed network (see Abstract), and

Art Unit: 2622

that claim 2 serves to further limits the data source of claim 1, which is explicitly implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network.)

Regarding claim 22, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 2 as discussed above.

**Claims 3, 23, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) and Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in view of Qian (US 6,950,130) and in further view of Aihara et al. (US 6,223,190.)**

Regarding claim 3, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 3, (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), except for teaching a system wherein said ancillary data files include an image background file and an Internet webpage file. However, Sarbadhikari does teach merging ancillary data files with those captured by the camera ('264 – col. 5 lines 22-27), such as image template files ('264 - figs. 8 and 9, col. 6 lines 56-59) and overlay files ('264 - col. 5 line 25-27), for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations ('264 - col. 10 lines 24-30.)

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include



background files as taught by Qian with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Furthermore, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files as taught by Aihara, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Regarding claim 23, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 3 as discussed above.

Regarding claim 46, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 11/31 supra), including wherein said ancillary data module analyzes said descriptor tag corresponding to a downloaded one of said ancillary data files, said ancillary data module responsively assigning said downloaded one of said ancillary data files to one of several file categories in said imaging device ('264 - col. 7 lines 31-44), said file categories including a template category ('264 col. 10 line 24 – col. 11 line 13), an overlay category ('264 - col. 7 line 43), and an instructions

category ('264 - col. 9 line 51 – col. 10 line 18; col. 10 lines 43-50.) However, neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to disclose a background category or an Internet web page category.

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) Based on these, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files, and an associated category for them within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device, all of which being found within an organized (categorized) format to facilitate their use.

Further, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files, and an associated category for them within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates, overlays, and backgrounds, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device, all of which being found within an organized (categorized) format to facilitate their use.

**Claims 12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) and Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in view of Aihara et al. (US 6,223,190.)**

Regarding claim 12, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 12 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production equipment ('264 - col. 6 lines 58-63.) However, neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to teach a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are also created by a system user on a local computer device.

Nevertheless, Aihara teaches that a user can create the ancillary data file (col. 7 lines 33-38.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a user to create the ancillary data file, in conjunction with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg in which ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer, so that a user may not only have the ability to employ the ancillary data files provided by a manufacturer, but also to create their own ancillary data files in order to give the result its distinctive appearance ('190 – col. 7 lines 36-38.) It is further noted that the specification at lines 1-8 of page 15, provides for the creation of ancillary data files by the system user in one embodiment, and alternatively, by a manufacturer in another.

Regarding claim 32, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 12 as discussed above.

**Claims 18-20, 38-40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Anderson (US 6,177,957.)**

Regarding claim 18, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 18 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 17 supra), except for teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module performs an off-line management procedure for said one or more ancillary data files that have been downloaded from said data source, said off-line management procedure including a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module categorizes said one or more ancillary data files, said imaging device responsively updating camera menus to include said one or more ancillary data files to thereby enable a system user to utilize said one or more ancillary data files. It is noted that Sarbadhikari does teach on-line management of ancillary data files, in that the identified files may be selectable chosen by the user when connected to the data source (col. 4 lines 40-47; col. 7 lines 38-47.)

Nevertheless, Anderson is found to teach dynamically updating software driven features in an electronic imaging device, in which the user may supplement the baseline application programming of the imaging device (col. 2 lines 18-25.) The system of Anderson provides a procedure for updating of camera menus to reflect the addition of

one or more ancillary data files, thereby enabling a system user to utilize one or more of the ancillary data files, (col. 8 line - col. 9 line 19.) The procedure of Anderson further teaches a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module categorizes said one or more ancillary data files (figs. 7 and 8; col. 8 line 1 – col. 9 line 19.) Although Anderson employs hot mounted files, Anderson demonstrates a teaching of a menu reorganization procedure for files made accessible to the imaging device. When taken in light of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which includes ancillary data files selected and downloaded to the imaging device from a computer in a distributed computer network, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to add the functionality of a user accessible menu which was appropriately updated to reflect the newly added software enhancements available, so that the user may fully utilize all the imaging device's available functionality. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a file descriptor identification procedure similar to that taught by Anderson, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to correctly identify and implement the ancillary data files, and their corresponding functionality, which have been added to increase the available functionality of the imaging device, based on the selected files previously added via download from a computer in a distributed computer network. As to the occurrence of the procedure taught above, in conjunction with a teaching by Anderson of the procedure occurring within the imaging device (fig. 8), it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the procedure of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg,

and Anderson be performed off-line, so that once the selected files had been downloaded, the imaging device is free to operate as a physically autonomous device, having no further need to be tethered or on-line with the computer, and free to perform the procedure at locations other than those accessible to the computer and at times when on-line accessibility is limited or no longer available.

Regarding claim 19, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 19 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said off-line management procedure includes a file reorganization procedure ('957 – col. 9 lines 1-6) and a file deletion procedure ('957 – col. 9 line 55 – col. 10 line18).

Regarding claim 20, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 20 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device utilizes an editing module ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 22) from said ancillary data module to effectively combine selected ones of said one or more ancillary data files with one or more images from said image data to thereby create a new composite image ('264 - col. 5 lines 22-24, col. 10 lines 30-36.)

Regarding claims 38-40 although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 18-20, respectively, as discussed above.

Regarding claim 41, Sarbadhikari teaches storing one or more ancillary data files in a data source (col. 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a computer (fig. 11 indicator 4; col. 11 lines 26-37), capturing said image data with an imaging device (col. 2 line 66 – col. 3 line 2; col. 5 line 55 – col. 6 line 26; col. 11 lines 26-37), transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device by using an ancillary data module (col. 4 lines 44-47; fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), and manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files (col. 6 lines 5-58; col. 10 lines 24-39), said ancillary data files performing one or more on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view, manipulate select and download said ancillary data files, said one or more on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional communication path currently exists from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 37-56; col. 7 lines 15-50; col. 9 lines 9-13; col. 11 lines 26-37), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 40.) However, Sarbadhikari does not teach any of the above steps occurring in conjunction with a computer in a distributed computer network. Additionally, although Sarbadhikari does teach the above program/programming/processor related steps, Sarbadhikari does not teach each step involving program instructions within a computer-readable medium.

Nevertheless, Steinberg is found to teach similar steps for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed

(fig. 1 indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create the steps for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer or data source.

Furthermore, Anderson is found to teach a computer readable medium comprising program instructions for a system that dynamically updates software functions in an electronic imaging device (col. 13 lines 33-54; col. 14 lines 25-43.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transfer the steps as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which are effectuated by processors within programmed devices, and due to their processor based execution, are employed as programmed instructions, onto a computer readable medium comprising program instructions as taught by Anderson, so that they may be easily transferred or from one computer in a distributed computer network to another computer in another distributed computer network, or so that they may be loaded as firmware onto a device to update or restore camera functionality without having to update or replace device hardware.



**Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Harada (US 6,195,511.)**

Regarding claim 43, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 43 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), except wherein a data manager from said ancillary data module deletes a local ancillary data file in said imaging device after detecting a file type of a newly-downloaded one of said ancillary data files.

Nevertheless, Harada is found to teach the rewriting of camera programming upon detecting that a newer version has been downloaded (col. 6 line 28 – col. 7 line 7; in which the rewriting of a file is determined by the examiner to be equivalent to a deletion because the original file is ultimately replaced by a newer version of the file.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to delete a local file after detecting a newer file as taught by Harada with the method as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to provide a method updating camera programming while maintaining minimum/lower memory requirements.

**Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Qian (US 6,950,130), in view of Berstis (US 6,721,001), in view of Silverbrook et al. (US 6,894,694.)**

Regarding claim 44, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), including wherein said ancillary data files include a text overlay file for superimposing upon said image data ('264 – col. 5 lines 22-27), special program instructions that directly enable or instruct said image device how to utilize said ancillary data files ('264 – col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 25), and template files that that are utilized as settings or frameworks for combining with said image data ('264 col. 10 line 24 – col. 11 line 13), said template files including an image transition file ('264 – col. 10 lines 46-50) and a still template file ('264 – figs. 8 and 9, col. 10 lines 26-30.) However, although Sarbadhikari and Steinberg provide for the inclusion of other files capable of affecting the captured image data ('264 – col. 4 lines 61-63), neither expressly provide for a background file of visual background data for combining with said image data, or template files including an animated template file and a voice-annotated template file.

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files as taught by Qian with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Berstis is found to disclose voice annotation programming (fig. 3 indicator 304, col. 4 lines 5-8.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for a voice-annotation as taught by Berstis as another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, and backgrounds, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.

Silverbrook is found to disclose animation programming (col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 6.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for animation as taught by Silverbrook as another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, Qian, and Berstis so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, backgrounds, and voice-annotations, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to further expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.

Further, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files as taught by Aihara, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

**Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Park et al. (US 6,731,305), Kondoh et al. (US 6,968,058), and Satoh et al. (US 5,717,496.)**

Regarding claim 45, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 11/31 supra), except for expressly disclosing wherein said descriptor tag includes a data format, a data type, a data structure, and a data size.

Nevertheless, it is well known to those skilled in the art to include descriptor information associated with data information, as disclosed by Park (data structure and size, col. 4 lines 22-24), Kondoh (data format, col. 4 lines 60-64), and Satoh (data type, fig. 50, col. 26 lines 57-66.) Based on these teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a wide breadth of information to be includable with a descriptor tag so expand embedded run information and other related pre-processed information.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Contacts***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly L. Jerabek whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7312**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on **(571) 272-7372**. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is **(571) 273-7300**. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2622

submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the Examiner at (571) 273-7312.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLJ

  
TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER